

CENTER CITY ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY AD HOC COMMITTEE

MAY 1, 2019

2:00 P.M.

Committee Members Present:

Councilmember Bill Hickman
Jim Adair
Cameron Brewer
Lee Hall
Keith McCabe
Richard McKown
Byron Morris
Autumn McMahon

Mayor Lynne Miller

Committee Members Absent:

Councilmember Holman

Staff Present:

Jane Hudson	Ken Danner
Anais Starr	Todd McLellan
Beth Muckala	Scott Sturtz
Terry Floyd	
Sara Kaplan	
Roné Tromble	
Tara Reynolds	
Carrie Evenson	

Public Present:

Jayne Crumpley	Bill Woods
Russ Kaplan	Tammy McKown
Peter Petromilli	Gabriel Bird
Brad Worster	
Brent Swift	

Councilmember Hickman – We're going to call the Center City Administrative Delay Ad Hoc Committee meeting to order for Wednesday, May 1st. First item on our agenda is Welcome, so welcome. Thank you everybody for being here. Appreciate your time, and everyone here in the audience, as well.

This agenda was intended to not necessarily be the agenda just for this meeting, but to begin to list out the topics that the committee has provided feedback on and that staff has also asked to be considered and discussed by this committee. I will just say, one thing that I make note of that we did not include on this agenda – I don't want people to think that it's not something that we will be talking about – is the design review guidelines and design review discussion. That's been something that we've heard from the community, as well as from others, as a topic to be discussed and I just noticed that was not listed on this agenda. So it's not necessarily completely inclusive, but I did want to make that comment so there wasn't any confusion that is something we still hope to try to get to. But the point in listing all these out was so that committee members would be aware that we have a lot of things left still to discuss. So time is of the essence in trying to make some decisions and move forward.

So that being said, the first item on our agenda, and probably the thing that's really one of the key things we do need to get accomplished, is to go through the technical manual. So that's what we're going to do first with Jane, our Interim Planning Director, leading that discussion. There might be some items that she skips over or we table, because they're going to be discussed in one of these topics further down the list. So I'm going to try to manage the meeting as best I can, and maybe ask you to hold off on those questions on certain topics that might be discussed later, so we can get through

the technical manual first and then work our way through some of these other topics, because we have some additional staff here supporting our meeting today that maybe usually aren't, like the folks from Public Works. So I want to make sure to utilize their time and get a chance to have Carrie make her presentation and continue our discussion about the impervious surface from last time.

So, Jane, I'm going to turn the floor over to you now. Okay?

Ms. Hudson – Okay. So, first of all, I want to welcome Autumn. She's with us today, so that's exciting.

Two housekeeping. We had been talking about the projects over on Monnett and Dean's Row, and there had been questions about the height – stories. Monnett is a true 3-story and there are living units on the 3rd floor. The Dean's Row is a 2-story. I just wanted to make sure that I had answered those questions for you guys.

Did you guys bring your Working Copy, or do you have access to it? I'm just going to go through these. Some of these, we don't really need to comment. As Councilmember Hickman said, there'll be some that we will move past.

Essentially, just within the Index, we've got to identify the Process and Incentives, and the Center City PUD area.

Under Authority, on page 5, it stated that "The Director of Planning and Community Development is authorized to review and approve applications for Certificate of Compliance" – that is actually the Director of Planning and Community Development, as well as the Development Review Team, so we need to add the DRT in there.

If anybody has anything as we go along, please stop me.

On page 6, we need to add in that there's a sign deposit fee of \$25 that is returnable when they return their signs back to us. It's just that's what we've typically done to cover the costs on this. We've lost a few already and want to make sure that we get that deposit in there.

On page 7, under 2 at the top of the page, just outlining that at the DRT meeting we will inform the applicant that materials and studies and meetings will be required if they have to come back to us. We wanted to have them on the same page.

At the bottom, this is more of a legal question, but a process – as far as an appeal for a decision by the Director on a Certificate of Compliance, is that also an Administrative Adjustment? So if a Director says no, can the applicant appeal an Administrative Adjustment and go to Planning Commission and City Council – and is that a process just like we rezone? When we rezone, we do a notification for 350 feet. Is that what the committee thinks someone should have to do if they are appealing the decision? So the Director thinks, and DRT thinks, that it doesn't meet the standard of the Code and the Director says no. Are we going to require the notification of the adjacent property owners?

Mr. Adair – What's the appeal process under our Euclidian code?

Ms. Hudson – Well, for the actual Zoning Ordinance, they go to Board of Adjustment.

Councilmember Hickman – What is the appeal process from a Building Official's decision?

Ms. Hudson – Board of Appeals. So, within the Zoning Ordinance, we notify and within the Board of Appeals, that is just a posting of the meeting and there's an application. That's for Building Code, so there's really no notice going out for that.

Councilmember Hickman – Well, it appears that what was intended would be that it goes to the Planning Commission and City Council if there's an appeal. So what's the difference between Certificate of Compliance or Administrative Adjustment?

Ms. Hudson – The Administrative Adjustment is on page 8.

Councilmember Hickman – So if somebody disagrees with a decision about Certificate of Compliance or the application of the Administrative Adjustment standards by the Director, they can appeal that to the Planning Commission and then to the City Council.

Ms. Hudson – Right. And so is there a legal notice required for that?

Councilmember Hickman – I think that there should be notice before it gets to City Council of people in the area of this appeal.

Ms. Hudson – So the 350 foot notification – we would mail out notice. That's what I wanted to know. I wanted to know if we would do that process.

Mr. McKown – Are there any processes where that's not required?

Ms. Hudson – When we had the administrative appeal, applicants could go straight to City Council for ...

Councilmember Hickman – Administrative delay.

Ms. Hudson – I'm sorry, the administrative delay. You could go straight to City Council to request an approval to move forward. So there wasn't a notification.

Mr. McKown – But are there other processes within the City that items that come before the City Council that don't require notification?

Ms. Starr – To hear an appeal from the Historic District, it just goes straight to City Council.

Ms. Hudson – No 350 foot notification.

Mr. McKown – So could this be treated like a Historic Preservation decision that goes straight to City Council, if you're appealing that, and there is no 350' notification? The difficulty with that is it's a time thing and then it's got to be a certified list and it's got to go through title work. Those are really tricky to put together.

Councilmember Hickman – I can live without the notice. I understand what you're saying. I think Anais's example of the Historic District Commission appeal – I didn't realize that there wasn't a notice associated with that, and that does seem like potentially an analogous situation. I'm never going to oppose a notice requirement, if you will. Just so you know, Richard, I was thinking from the perspective of like an appeal to the Board of Adjustment that I'm pretty sure that there's a notice associated with that. That was kind of where my default.

Mr. McKown – The same 350' requirement for Board of Adjustment?

Ms. Tromble – It's 300.

Mr. McKown – 300' requirement for Board of Adjustment? Okay.

Councilmember Hickman – Committee members, what are your thoughts? We need to give her some feedback on this.

Ms. McMahon – I like the analogy of the Historic Commission, and not requiring the notice. I think that simplifies it and I think people are invested in it. They'll know it's going to be on the City Council agenda anyway.

Mr. McKown – Yeah. I think that's very accurate.

Councilmember Hickman – People will find out. People will more likely find out by it being on the Council agenda than maybe getting something in the mail, frankly.

Ms. McMahon – Agreed. And I think it's just going to slow it down.

Mr. Adair – I think you're challenging a staff interpretation, as opposed to coming in trying to change something.

Ms. McMahon – Right.

Ms. Hudson – Thank you.

Councilmember Hickman – So I'm going to say no notice required. Is that the consensus? Because what we're going to do, guys, is when we get to a certain point here, I'm going to ask for a motion to accept these changes as presented by staff and as we have discussed. So this change will be no notice required.

Okay, Jane. Keep going.

Ms. Hudson – On page 8, it's the same scenario. If you're looking at Administrative Adjustments, one of the options that the Planning Director shall review the application in accordance with the Administrative Adjustment Standards and it says that they can deny the application. So if they deny the application – we just covered that. So by adding

Administrative Adjustment over here under C, under Appeal Administrative Adjustment – I just answered my own question. Never mind. Moving on.

On page 9, under Elements, we have Fenestration and administrative approval for 5% elements. Do we want to put in there a percentage of signs that they can appeal and have an additional 5% of signage allowed?

Councilmember Hickman – Is there a section in here on signs?

Ms. Hudson – There is another section on signs, and we can include this then if you want to. I wanted to know, with that Administrative Adjustment Standards, under Section C, it lists those abilities of the Planning Director. So we can just come back to that, if you want to.

Councilmember Hickman – Off the cuff, my only question is are we looking at this on a percentage basis or on a feet basis, and I don't know what makes more sense or not. I'm not familiar with the sign standard.

Ms. Hudson – It would be the area up to 5%, if that's what you chose. You could get up to 5% more than what would be allowed.

Mr. McKown – Variation in terms of size of sign. I think that would be great to add that in here, just to keep the process flowing. I believe this is very specific about what is a pedestrian-oriented sign – something perpendicular to the sidewalk that sticks out and that you see it as a pedestrian. It's part of the charm. I mean, signs are crazy important to creating walkability.

Councilmember Hickman – Do we want to flip to the section on signs real quick?

Ms. Hudson – We can. It's on page 23.

Councilmember Hickman – We've got some visuals, too.

Ms. Hudson – Yes. I went out and just took a couple pictures of the signs that we have there. We've got this one, this, we have Neighborhood, and we have Winstons. Those were all approved under the Center City Form Based Code. For the Greenhouse, they have 12 sq. ft. Pryor's Pizza Kitchen has 42 sq. ft. Jam has 2 signs; they have this sign on Main and then around the corner they have the sign facing the railroad tracks and they have 37 sq. ft. on the north and east elevations. Then we have Winstons, which has 17 sq. ft. on the north elevation.

So what is guiding this question about the sign code is we have some mixed buildings that are going to be going in on Main Street within the Center City Form Based Code. We have a unit on the ground floor that's going to need a sign. We have businesses on the 2nd, possibly 3rd, floor that would also need signage, and the restrictions are pretty limiting. They can have wall signs, obviously. They can have these signs, but if you have multiple businesses on the 2nd and 3rd floors, the signs can go no higher than 20' and no lower than 11'. The letters shall not exceed 18" in height and not come closer

than 2' to a common lot line. Company logos can go within that band, but they cannot be larger than 8 sq. ft. There's a blade sign. There's an issue about a blade sign. It can only be 6 sq. ft.

So we have an applicant that's getting ready to open the business there on Main Street. There's going to be a business upstairs, and then ground floor is going to be leased out as well. They are really struggling to get the needed signage for their businesses that are going to be within that building. Do you want to say anything? It's up to you. I'm kind of coming in from the outside on this one. I know you've been working with other staff on this, and I do apologize – I'm not in the loop really. But if you want to explain.

Councilmember Hickman – Do you want to stand up and identify yourself?

Dr. Bird – Sure. Gabriel Bird, local dentist. I've actually already moved into my building. I'm on the 2nd floor, and the whole 1st floor – we've got some good interest, actually, some letters of intent on the way in – it's going to be leased out. So if you look at the front of my building, there's the main entrance for that. Well, my entrance is my elevator shaft. So I don't have a good width there to do a nice big sign like that that's flat. So I'd like to do a bladed sign to indicate where my front door is and kind of where my business is and then that kind of sign can go above that ground floor rental space. Well, right now I'm limited to 2' by 3' and when we put that up on the rendering, which I can email all of you the photo of it, it looks kind of silly. It's just not big enough. What I'd like is that effect of those classic downtown signs -- like Sooner Theater, like Arvest Bank used to have – having a nice big blade sign out there saying Dentistry with my logo at the top to clearly indicate where my entrance is and kind of how to get to me, so people aren't walking into that ground floor looking for the stairwell to get up to me and that sort of thing. Then we've also run into – because that is where my elevator is, there are some structural limitations even to putting a flat sign versus being able to just put a nice, strong cantilever out there. From a wayfinding, from an aesthetic point of view, the best way to do it for me is that blade type sign.

Ms. Hudson – How big is the sign that you designed? How many square feet is the blade sign that you've designed?

Dr. Bird – That is a great question.

Mr. Worster – It's about 15.

Dr. Bird – Thank you. About 15. Then the other part was even we looked at ways to mess with a total area of the 2'x3', but then the legal came back saying it says very plainly 2'x3' – nothing about an equivalent area. So we looked at doing a sign that was 1' wide and 6' tall and doing tall lettering, and there could have been ways to work with that, but we're locked into that 2'x3' rectangle. So, right now I've got a little A-frame sign on the sidewalk to help people find their way to me, which also isn't highly visible, but that's what I'd like to do and still in fitting with the style of downtown.

Mr. McKown – We should really put some thought into this, because I don't know the history of either of these that are in the slide. This would be a much more effective urban sign if it were sticking out perpendicular to the building as a blade sign. It would do the kind of things signage do for cities. If you look at historic photos – just Google it – historic photos of downtown Oklahoma City or Fort Worth, or wherever – it's a photograph of the collection of signs. It's not a photograph of a collection of brick buildings. It's always the case. Signs are really cool. There are times where architects hate them and they're like we want this invisible sign that it looks good on the rendering if you were standing across the street looking at the building. What probably caused these two buildings to end up with flat signs – think about The Winston. If you're a pedestrian walking up, you can't even see that sign because the awning is obscuring your view. But it looks good on the computer screen. Right? People are making decisions based on this type of virtual reality, not actual reality. That was the way to get the biggest sign. Because if you go back to the client, they're going I need the biggest sign I can get – get me the biggest sign. I don't know the answer or I swear I'd just tell it to you, but it's probably a percentage of the size of the façade of the building, because a really big building, if you put a little bitty blade sign on it, looks wrong. We just put Riley Permion's sign on the Rock Island Plow Building. That building is 52' tall, 5 stories, and it's 75' wide. It's a massive old building. That sign is like 21' tall and it sticks way out – I think it's 4' wide. Huge sign. It still looks modest on the building. But it just didn't make sense to make it any bigger. We had to go get a certificate of approval – Oklahoma City has got a whole process around that. Those two signs have got to be considered a fail. They're not getting us the city we want. They're fine, but they're not pedestrian-oriented signs, so we've just written small signage in here because architects hate signage. Anybody disagree with that?

Mr. Morris – I like signage. We were involved with the theater that's being restored downtown. That's got a humungous sign on it.

Mr. McKown – Well, alright. Not all architects.

Mr. McCabe – I would think, because it's clearly setting a standard over horizontal flat signage, as opposed to blade signage, and it's definitely made a distinction in the wording. So was the intent trying to maintain a minimalistic sign on the blade to – you know, a lot of cities have gone that way. The height restrictions, so you don't look like you have a billboard sticking out of your building. So if we're looking at that, maybe it is – maybe the blade standard maybe needs to be changed. But I still think that we would have to have a restriction on how far out from the building. We don't want billboards hanging off the side of these buildings, Richard.

Mr. McKown – Usually structure will limit that, because of our wind. So you're not going to end up with billboards sticking off buildings. You could. How do we craft this in a way where we give some latitude toward – where it looks wrong on your rendering and we go, well, why don't you make it this big and then bring that back. But to try and put a percentage to it – this is more art than science.

Mr. McCabe – I think that's where Dr. Bird's problem comes from – if I understood it correctly -- he's able to come up with some really great designs, but right here says it has to be 2'x3'.

Mr. McKown – Right.

Mr. McCabe – So it's very restrictive on what he's allowed to do, so City staff has no ability to make any kind of amendment or change. I think that's what we're looking for, is for him to be able to bring what he's bringing, and to allow the City staff an opportunity to make amendment.

Ms. Hudson – Can I make a suggestion? I know Dr. Bird is working with a design professional on this. So maybe we could get the sign – we could get the percentage of the sign in relation to the building. Bring that back for the next meeting, and have those images and everything and maybe that's something we could – instead of getting in the weeds because we don't have the information as far as what he's trying to do. Is that okay with everybody?

Mr. Adair – Yeah. I'd love to see what Gabe is getting ready to do. I'm not certain that this is a discussion that is exclusive to Center City. I mean, we're talking about four blocks of West Main and you cross the tracks and you've got the next four blocks of East Main, which fall under our regular Sign Ordinance. I believe, probably for 20+ years, the Sign Ordinance absolutely precluded blade signs. It now permits them. Correct, Jane?

Ms. Hudson – I'd have to check on that one. I don't know the Sign Code.

Mr. Adair – Call Mr. Stenis. I understand.

Mr. Brewer – We have a few blade signs going down Main Street. Stash is one.

Mr. Adair – I think for years The Diner sign was non-conforming. Tastes and opinions change. My real question is, are the sign restrictions in Center City more liberal or more restrictive than our regular sign ordinance?

Councilmember Hickman – I think that's the information to bring back next time, also, Jane, is in addition to the specific issue with Dr. Bird's project. Also, I think it would be interesting to see what Center City does compared to what – because we're talking about half of Main Street here. So how we compared treating West Main versus East Main from what the standard is. I think we'd all like to know were we being more restrictive or less restrictive.

Mr. Brewer – Not to over-complicate it, but I also think that there may be some nuances when you enter into the more neighborhood areas. Main Street is different than Gray, is different than James Garner. So that might relate to precluding residential on the 1st floor, and whatever we decide there. But that's just one other thing to think through. Is there a higher percentage allowance along Main Street, or maybe it's lower for some reason?

Councilmember Hickman – Good point. Yeah. Brad?

Mr. Worster – My name is Brad Worster and Dr. Bird has asked me to help him try to resolve this, because he's a dentist and he does that from 9 to 5. His business is there and he has very little signage right now. So his option is to amend his PUD, and that filing date is Monday, to be heard the end of July or in August. So he's in limbo. If he waits for this committee to make all these decisions and then they don't come out right, and then he has to file for his PUD, then he's in November or December, and he's got a business there working now. So I don't know what to do with that, other than we're planning on filing a PUD amendment on Monday, which is the radius, all the stuff, so that he can have a sign so his existing customers know where his office is now. So I don't know how this committee can make that faster. But there's no other venue. Can't do Board of Adjustment. Can't do anything.

Mr. Adair – Brad, hopefully, we're going to rake them into the Council. We don't have the authority sitting here to change anything.

Councilmember Hickman – Yeah. Even if this committee recommends, it wouldn't be until Council voted on it in July that you would know for sure.

Mr. Worster – I don't want to make this committee mad, like we're running a parallel track to what you're doing. His timeline is faster, totally. So we're happy to help do that. The other part is he's going to spend thousands of dollars amending his PUD so that he can have a sign. That's a little rough to put on people. I don't know if there's any way to change that.

Councilmember Hickman – That's part of what this committee is trying to accomplish, is to identify things like that we can fix. It might be too late for Dr. Bird, unfortunately. I understand what you're saying, but we're trying.

Ms. Hudson – That's exactly what I wanted to point out, what Brad was saying is that any amendments have to be either a CCPUD or we could do something as far as Board of Adjustment or variances, or something like that. Just something to consider moving forward.

Ms. Hall – Didn't we already consider a project that wanted a larger sign on Gray that was part of their PUD?

Ms. Hudson – They did a CCPUD, and their letters are a hair taller than what's in here as part of his CCPUD. He had his sign package ready to go whenever he moved forward. But he's a single business, and so it was a little easier for him to get everything lined out.

Ms. McMahon – So would he have fallen within that 5% that we were discussing, if we were to make that amendment on page 9?

Ms. Hudson – I'm not sure, but I can check what it would have been.

Councilmember Hickman – So let's table the page 9 and page 23 conversation about signage. We'll put that to bring back next time. Okay, Jane? So now I'm looking back on page 9, Section 207. You have "Legal Beth". So I'll let you pick back up on that part so we can keep moving.

Ms. Hudson – I'm trying to remember where I was. That's fine. We've already taken care of that with what we did on page 7.

So on page 11, that's simply housekeeping. It says "CCFFC" and we need to get that straight.

Then moving on to page 13. That goes hand-in-hand with the possible changes on page 18. I hate to jump around on you, but the additional sheet that you got today, which is Section 402, General Provisions. This was handed out previously, and this was the discussion about how we wanted to amend this complete and discrete discussion. Does everybody remember this, and how it did change the ability for complete and discrete?

So if everybody is good with what we've proposed to change on page 18 with this – when it was handed out, it was Exhibit A.

Councilmember Hickman – My recollection was that is an additional – it wasn't substituting.

Ms. Hudson – No. This did substitute. As written, this substitutes – and I didn't give you the annotated copy, but it's under 2 – under 2, we've got 60' for Urban. That stays the same. Then b is changing for Urban General, Urban Residential, Townhouse/Small Apartment and Detached Frontages, we've changed that to 50' when the total street frontage is 100' or more and 35' when the total street frontage is less than 100. Honestly, this has been probably one of the biggest sticking points of the review process when the applications came in – Autumn has been in on a couple of those meetings – trying to decipher how the complete and discrete was going to be applied.

Councilmember Hickman – Is the committee comfortable with – basically, what we're doing here is, if it's not less than 100', you're having to make a change every 35'? We suspect the reason why this was done this way originally was we thought there were going to be larger developments than the individual lot-by-lot basis we're getting. This will require a little more façade composition change, if I'm understanding everything correctly. Which should help with the look and form of the product.

Ms. McMahon – It would certainly streamline the application process. So I would very much support the change.

Russ Kaplan – I just had a question. My concern is that Detached Frontage – that's the yellow – correct? If you're building a 40' house on a 50' lot, and you say you have to change the façade every 35' – you're building a single-family home that's 40' wide, you're going to have to put 2 fronts on it?

Mr. McKown – It makes no sense.

Mr. Kaplan – So you should take the Detached out. My suggestion.

Mr. McKown – If you're building a building that's 50' wide, having to split it into 2 discrete facades doesn't make any sense to me. If you're building a 300' long building, breaking it up into 3 segments – that starts to make sense. It's a little dishonest. It's one building, built at one moment. It's very artificial to break it up. Jeff Speck talks about this in the Walkable City Rules: 101 Rules for Walkability. It's, I think, Rule 96, actually, and he specifically mentions the 300' long façade being broken up into 3 segments – 100' segments. This is overkill. The example of a single-family house.

Autumn, I just couldn't hear what you said. What did you say?

Ms. McMahon – I was just saying, for the application process, it would streamline it. I mean, to Jane's point, this has been a huge source of confusion and issue, essentially. So I think it would streamline the process, but your points make sense as well.

Councilmember Hickman – I guess the question is, if they're building a duplex, are we considering – and it's a lot less than 100' – I think to your point, Richard – that a single building, or do we want them to break up a duplex into multiple facades? I, personally, think that, based on the charrette process, people would want to see that broken up into different facades. I understand the single-family home issue, and that makes sense to me, in that if it's a single-family home, maybe it doesn't need to be broken up into different facades. But we've got to remember that, on some of these lots, we're getting what isn't actually a single building – we're getting duplexes that, to me at least, are two buildings that are smooshed together. Peter?

Mr. Petromilli – What we discussed last week – the only area that would allow duplexes anymore is pink. So blue is going to have 3; yellow is going to have 1; orange is no longer residential on the 1st floor, so basically it just goes away.

Councilmember Hickman – Well, it doesn't, because – I mean, it still would apply to the Townhouse/Small Apartment.

Mr. Petromilli – I thought there was going to be 3-unit minimum and they're stackable. I guess if you had a larger lot and you had 3 units on it.

Mr. Adair – I don't think we're to it, yet, but we're also going to look at a side yard requirement, aren't we, Jane?

Ms. Hudson – We are.

Mr. Adair – So typically on a 50' lot, you're talking about a 40' buildable front.

Councilmember Hickman – But this goes up to 100'.

Ms. Hudson – I guess the question is, though – and I see what Peter is saying – if we're going to do the ...

Mr. McKown – Go ahead. I'm being distracting.

Ms. Hudson – That's okay. Go ahead, because I'm sure yours will explain more.

Mr. McKown – These are the same buildings, and I drew this up when we were talking about this the last time. These are all 50'. They're all lot line to lot line. 4-story, 3-story, 3-story, 3-story. Creating this sort of artificiality – my design team wouldn't come down here and build this. We would design one of these, if we had a 50' lot, and we would just go through the process and we'd make our argument why this is more natural, more what is found throughout the world. These kind of artificial things – I'll give you an example. The Hill in Oklahoma City has got this kind of like real artificiality about it, and it doesn't feel right. It's got a real kind of stage set quality to it and it moves against authenticity. And authenticity is not kind of important when you're dealing with the millennials – it's everything. So when we start creating this sort of artificiality, we're moving in the opposite direction of creating a place that has long-lasting, enduring sense of planning for permanence. That's ultimately why we're all here. You know, we're trying to build a permanent part of the town that becomes loved and adored, and usually these things that just have pancake makeup on – they don't function over time.

If we were dealing with a lot of 100' long frontages, or 300' long frontages, it might be an idea to hold to breaking it up into segments, according to like Rule 96 from Walkable Cities, but I feel like we have overshot this one.

Mr. McCabe – If we're truly talking about a duplex, and if we do the duplexes with the 5' side setbacks on each side, it's completely separating that duplex from the buildings beside them, we, in essence, have created that break, so it's not this continuous flow. So the nature of the side setback has created the break. So then to me, it's almost that we need to take this wording out, because a duplex at 18' and 22', or 20' and 20', however you break it up in that 40' – it's all personal – I don't think it's attractive to build an 18' wide, 20' wide façade. I think it looks very fake. So maybe we just remove that on the smaller lots with the side setback.

Mr. McKown – This is just the other portion of drawing, showing the buildings separated.

Councilmember Hickman – What if we have this requirement only in the Townhouse/Small Apartment area?

Mr. McKown – Why? How about we have this requirement only on frontages longer than 100'?

Councilmember Hickman – We could put it back to where it was, which was it has to be 100'.

Ms. Hudson – I need to say something, though. So if you look down further under Façade Composition – I don't want us to get so deep in the woods on number 2 before we forget about number 4, because number 4 talks about clearly different ground story façade composition (both framing materials), at least two different bay configurations, change in wall material (changes in paint color are insufficient), and so on and so forth. So, if we're talking about changing or eliminating 2, number 4 is key as well. So this really plays into that whole design review committee. We need to be careful to not eliminate too much of this because, if we do, we're going to end up in a situation where – and I've told you before, whenever we were getting some of the buildings constructed, we were getting phone calls that there wasn't enough variation. I understand people around the table don't like to see a duplex split, but there are people in the community that feel like they need to have that detail. That was what they talked about moving forward in the design charrette and so on and so forth. So I just want you to be aware that, if you take out the majority of this, we're going to end up with duplexes that are closer to the street, same brick, same size windows, 2-3 stories, however they end up being designed. You just need to have that information in your pocket.

Mr. Brewer – Here's a visual example of what Richard is showing in Cad form or sketch up. This is basically a comparison of a main street versus – the title of this article is "From McMansion to McMain Street" and this is from Congress for New Urbanism. An example of that here in Norman – although it's not built to Congress for New Urbanism standards, because the parking is in the front, is the Madison Square development over behind Lowe's. Its facades are broken up and it looks about as unauthentic as you can get. There's a couple of other examples down here. This is a common apartment – multi-family apartment design. This I'm guessing probably has 200 or 300 units in it. You see the breaking up of the façade, but it's clearly not different buildings. That's a very common look, unfortunately, in designs today. This is an article I'll send to everyone. I think it's really great. This just came out in mid-March and was from Congress for New Urbanism and talks about some ways to break up façade. One specific thing it discusses is height variations and how that can be a way of mitigating the – that you have a difference in – the Bird building is a good example of one where you have different height variations, where it is the same building, same façade, same brick, but it feels like you're breaking up the façade a little bit and it feels a little more natural. That may not be a solution, but just ideas here.

I think, again – like the signage – this is worth a very, very hard look, because I do think that the duplexes that have gone up outside of the side setbacks, they do not feel authentic. You can tell that they're one building right now. So that's a concern if that's just breaking up the façade for façade's sake. You're going to get a lot of the same thing. Those particular duplexes feel like – wow, you're breaking your façade, but the same exact design stacked against each other, so that doesn't really achieve what you're trying to achieve here, which makes it feel like there's variation. So this is something I'll send out to the committee. I know that doesn't help our discussion today.

Councilmember Hickman – So, Jane, the other part under here – section 4, the a, b, c and d and e – are those new?

Ms. Hudson – No. Under number 4? Is that what you said? I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you. Number 4. It used to be number 5. We took out number 4.

Councilmember Hickman – Okay. Isn't the real question whether or not we want to have a requirement to break up the façade on lots that are less than 100'?

Mr. Adair – I'm not having a problem with breaking up on 100', but typically we're talking about 50'. I am having trouble with requiring breaking up on 50'.

Councilmember Hickman – It was 75, right? 75' for Urban General or Residential Townhouse.

Ms. Hudson – Can I have Legal make a comment?

Ms. Muckala – What it formerly was – it was 75 for this sub-part 2.b, which has now been broken up into the two categories in the new handout. It was 75 for all. Then there was a number 4, which was an exemption when the street frontage is less than 100' on the block face. So it was as written currently meant to really be affecting buildings of 100 or more feet of frontage to break that up. So that was the scale. What the new handout does is literally adjust the scale – it shrinks it to apply to a smaller ratio.

Mr. Morris – It feels like it's going in the wrong direction.

Mr. McKown – I feel like we're going to come back with McMain Street conditions. I kind of think we should just leave it alone.

Councilmember Hickman – Well, let's ask this question, Jane. If we go back to what we had before, what would staff feel like they need to clarify to avoid these issues like Autumn has mentioned?

Ms. Hudson – Well, there was discussion with how the code was being administered, how staff that had been involved in the process from the beginning – how they were implementing the code. When we would have the meetings with the design professionals, they were reading it a different way. And I don't want to speak for Legal, but I will. We were having trouble interpreting it – bottom line. We had design professionals coming in, meeting after meeting after meeting. If this is how you want it to stay – if you don't want to make any changes – as far as I'm concerned – as far as staff is concerned, we need some more clarification on how this is to be implemented. I'll just leave it at that. Is there something you want to add, Byron?

Mr. Morris – Yeah. There was just too much ambiguity in how it's written. So trying to make it more restrictive isn't really addressing the fact that it seemed ambiguous.

Mr. McCabe – I see, by you excluding that number 4, that's where the key word is actually located, and you're removing that. It states in that item number 4 that if you're less than 100' you are exempt, and I think that's a big issue, and you're excluding that word

"exempt" to now adding a minimum of 35 on a 50' lot. I think that changes the whole meaning, and that's where we're going to get into the problem with these 50' lots.

Councilmember Hickman – I think the issue they run into is, under section 2 and section 4. Section 2 makes it sound like you should do it, but it goes down to 75' and even 60', and then number 4 says if you're less than 100' you're exempted. Just on the face of it, it looks like there is a bit of a conflict there. What I don't know is whether, under section 2.a, the old section – if the recommendation of the committee is that if it's less than 100' block face, whatever that means – I guess 100' frontage -- the recommendation is that there should be no change in the façade, then maybe these parts under section 2, instead of being 60' for Urban Storefront, 75' for Urban General, Urban Residential, etc., it should all just be 100. So if you're under 100', you're exempted.

Ms. McMahon – So just add to number 2 that if you're over 100' these things apply. Right? I think that would help to make the distinction between less than 100'.

Councilmember Hickman – Or it could be interpreted to be if you're less than 100' you don't have to apply, but if you're over 100' then every 60' we want you to break it up. So if you're 110', at 60' you've got to break it up.

Ms. McMahon – That's what I'm saying.

Councilmember Hickman – Okay.

Ms. McMahon – So to me, I read 4 as saying you're less than 100', you don't have to change anything. So, if that's our intent, then on 2 I think we need to add something that says if you're over 100' you do these things. Right? Jane, do you agree with that?

Ms. Muckala – I just wanted to clarify something in terminology. In former paragraph 4, it talks about street frontage of 100' on a block face. I just want to make sure we're not going to get the terms mixed up because we're not referring to block face in number 2. And really, also, again, I just wanted to clarify this is a changing of our ratio. Number 4 was removed only to allow it to be taken down. This was to break up larger buildings and this just broke slightly smaller buildings into slightly smaller pieces. So it's essentially a matter of the scale that's preferred. This can be adjusted in this format to meet whatever scale you think is appropriate if it's different than is currently written or in the document we handed out today. It can be adjusted.

Mr. Adair – Can I throw out an idea? I think I'm hearing several of us say the same thing. We'd like to see a façade change every 51'. If you're 50', one façade is fine. If you're over 50' – if you're 75, you need at least 2, and if you're up to 100 two.

Mr. McKown – Wait. This is a challenge to figure out what this actually says, but let's say you had 100' lot, I believe in paragraph 2 in a, it basically says ...

Mr. Brewer – You'd have a façade change split down Neighborhood Jam. That's 50'.

Mr. McKown – Right. What the code currently says, if you have 100' lot, we want you to split it up and 60' is the smallest you can split it up, unless, in c, it's part of a longer façade composition and there are smaller buildings that create this whole block face. It is a little bit ambiguous here, but 60' for Urban Storefront frontage sites – so you could end up with a 40 and a 60 in your 100, as opposed to split it down the middle with two 50s. So I think we need to search for clarity around what's here, and maybe just adding the term that, if your lot is 100' or greater, these rules apply, and then 4, if your lot is 100' or less, you're worried about other things, about percentage of windows, etc., but not trying to split.

Councilmember Hickman – Let me just ask this question and see if we can get some clarity here. If the street frontage is 100' or less, how many people think the front façade of whatever is built should be broken up in any fashion? Or if it's 100' street frontage, do you think that the façade of the structure should be allowed to be the same? Should we require it to be broken up? Should we rely upon the market and the architects doing it to decide the design, which could come with that later discussion of design review committee? Or do we want them to break it up if it's 100' frontage? I think that's the starting point. Where do you all stand on that? Keith? Byron? Jim?

Mr. Adair – To me, it's not just under 100.

Councilmember Hickman – Well, I'm picking 100, because that's kind of what we've done so far.

Mr. Adair – 50 is under 100. And on 50 I don't think you need a façade change.

Councilmember Hickman – Okay.

Mr. McKown – I'm of the opinion that 100' long building, if you can get two 50' lots side-by-side and it's 3 stories tall, that's beautifully going to fit in with the urban fabric. It really is. Jim's office is 140' from Main Street over to the alley – maybe 135'. But to give you an idea of that scale. Building across the street, same distance. So it's not 300' long.

Mr. Brewer – To ask the question, does that scale still fit in the small apartment setting as well?

Mr. McKown – The reason I think it probably fits in the small apartment thing is, again, you have a building and the idea of that building. It's an actual thing that got built in the year 2019, or whenever, and it's got its identity. You're struggling really hard to create that as an identity and as an identifiable thing. 100' is pretty small – it really is.

Councilmember Hickman – But in a neighborhood, that's a pretty massive size building, though, in fairness. 100' frontage building, uninterrupted. I mean, I'm not arguing with you, Richard, but I do think, to some extent in some – especially if you're talking about even if you're now talking about Detached Frontage – single-family homes – now we're flipping that narrative around to say 4 ...

Mr. Brewer – I think Detached should be taken out. I think this doesn't make any sense with that particular section. The point I see Richard making is that, is you break up a frontage of a single building with a different façade, but it's the same building, it's going to feel artificial, no matter if it's 100' or 50'. If you break it up in the middle, everybody is going to look at that building and say that is the same exact building and it looks funny to break it up into something else. But I also agree that 100' sounds like a pretty big building in a neighborhood setting. So it's almost a matter of whether we're comfortable with a 100' building being built in a neighborhood setting. I'm not saying we should restrict that or anything, but that might be what we get.

Mr. Adair – Actually, we tried to encourage it.

Mr. Petromilli – I'm going to call out a friend of mine – Bill Woods. He has a project on Symmes that has been broken up and I think there was a 75' lot and then maybe a 50' lot next to it. And they're beautifully done. But as an architect, I just keep thinking what could have been if he was allowed to develop that as one product – and just the scale and proportions and, like you were saying, just how authentic it would have looked. It's beautiful, but there is just a little bit there when they're broken into 20' sections as their lot lines had to be pulled in. So I just wanted to push really hard to not require setbacks in the blue area, because we see what it does and what is something that's nice could have been just tremendous. You know, something that was done well could have been extraordinary. And put everything aside on what's inside that building and whether we agree with it or don't agree with it. What we see on the street, and that's why I think what you're saying here – 125' frontage – we have an example. That could have been 125' and I think, at least in my humble opinion, it could have just been a real – not landmark project, but could have really just been something very, very special, even though – again, I'm not taking anything away from Bill – he did a fantastic job of what he does – but I think that is an example of something that went in the way of what we're talking about now and if we insert this legislation, will be basically what we're demanding more of that, instead of allowing him to do what really I feel should have been done there, which was more of what you see on this page where you've got to have this frontage – this large center one could have been 100'. It's like getting an ADA and it's like we could have had an A and a B there on 150' or 125'.

Ms. Hudson – Okay. Since you brought that up – thank you for transitioning, but I want to point out something. I think we're going to have to bring this façade composition back. We need to move forward. But I want to have one question answered, because I think it's an easy one. Under number 3 – and this is something that we dealt with on Bill's project. So number 3 says, "Each façade composition shall include a functioning street entry door." It states that here, and then it also states that requirement further into the code. Sorry, Bill, referring to the projects – and they're all great projects and they have great detail to them, but he struggled – Byron – I don't know how many meetings we had, but he's addressed off of Santa Fe, but because of the requirement in there, he had to maneuver these buildings around and get these doors. You dealt with this as well. So one of the things that we should talk about, or consider and put it on the table for next

meeting, is that if you have a functioning street door for your front entry and you're building your development that you have a side street over here as well, and on these lots that are corner lots, we have a 10'-ish required build line on these lots. This side may have 4'. It's difficult to get a stoop within that 4'. So we need an allowance in here that says if you have an active front – you have an entrance – you're not required to get another entrance on the side over here, because the side – the required build line – it's not going to allow you that area. Some of these are at 3 – Well, we've got this map up here now, and it shows some of these areas where the required build line is. It's almost at the property line. So, while it requires it, and we have to go with what the code says, maybe we want to consider, where someone doesn't necessarily have to have another side door for the same unit.

Mr. Morris – Or at least make that something that could go as an Administrative Adjustment.

Ms. Hudson – Yes. Thank you.

Councilmember Hickman – Okay. Jane, do you feel like you've got enough feedback to chew on this and we continue this discussion next meeting? On the frontage.

Ms. Hudson – With some additional input – emails, please. I know we have so many different ideas at the table. We're struggling with this.

Councilmember Hickman – I will say, just from my perspective, I do think the discussion of the Detached Frontages is a little bit – I almost think that I do kind of agree with what I think I heard other people say, that maybe that should be pulled out.

Ms. Hudson – Agreed.

Councilmember Hickman – Looking at that – it should be a single-family home. I'm not really sure this really even applies to it, so I certainly don't want to give the impression that we want a 100' frontage on a house.

Ms. Hudson – And we do need to add pink back in there – depending on how we go.

Councilmember Hickman – Yeah, we've already voted to do that.
So looking at this, what is Urban Residential?

Ms. Hudson – Orange.

Councilmember Hickman – That's Urban General.

Mr. Brewer – That's the portion along University.

Councilmember Hickman – Oh, gotcha.

Mr. Brewer – That limits the height.

Councilmember Hickman – Okay. So we're going to table the further discussion on the Section 402 piece. One thing that Peter brought up that I do – something I want us to circle back around to, Jane, and maybe in here right now, is the – what's caused us, from time to time, to cause these buildings to have to be broken up, as opposed to like where Mr. Woods or Peter own multiple lots together, why they couldn't have put their buildings together? I don't know if that's something that caused that or there's just a staff interpretation or whatever.

Ms. Hudson – I'm not sure I can answer that question.

Mr. Morris – From my experience, that was a staff interpretation. It was interpreted that you had to have – it didn't matter if the adjoining lots were owned by the same owner, they still had to be 10' apart.

Ms. Hudson – On the same lot?

Mr. Morris – No. On adjoining lots.

Ms. Hudson – On adjoining lots. I thought you were talking about the same lot.

Councilmember Hickman – No. I mean, it could be – if I owned four lots in a row, the feedback that I've heard from some in the community is that staff required them to still break up the buildings ...

Ms. Hudson – By the lot.

Councilmember Hickman -- Almost by lot, even though we do allow them to put lots together.

Ms. Hudson – Well, that goes to page ...

Councilmember Hickman – And that might have been the discussion that we had where the – because it was a duplex, one side on one side of a lot line, and one side on the other side of a lot line – I don't know.

Ms. Hudson – That was a discussion that came along very early – again, one of the issues – because in the code it says in the blue, although there are no individual side lot setbacks – we worked with Peter on his second one that came through whenever I was working on this, and I said, you know, it says there's no individual side lot setbacks, but prior to that the interpretation was that there had to be the 5' on either side of the building. So, again, we're getting back to this interpretation thing. That's why we've got to have this in black and white so we can look at it and say this is how it has to go.

Councilmember Hickman – I just want to make a note of that, because I do think it's something we need to circle back to, and I want to keep plodding ahead on this. I don't want to create a situation where we address these other issues but if projects come forward where multiple lots are owned and they want to put it together to where it looks more like a row house or something like that, that we don't have something in here that artificially or interpretation is causing those buildings to be broken up, because it seems like there's at least a couple projects right now that have been built that could have been done in a way where the buildings were put together versus broken up into duplexes and it could have created a different look. And they're saying – I've heard is that was in part based on an interpretation of the ordinance.

Okay. So on page 13 and 14, we're going to – well, 13, you were talking about under 2.a ...

Ms. Hudson – Yes. On page 13, it's related to what we were just talking about.

Councilmember Hickman – Okay. What about on 14 on the alleys?

Ms. Hudson – Alleys. That's part of the TIF. So we're going to move past that.

On page 18, we're going to address later.

On page 19, we just need to clarify this: "the average fronting sidewalk elevation" – is this public or private sidewalk? It should be public, but it doesn't say that. So we want to clarify.

Councilmember Hickman – Yeah, public.

Ms. Hudson – We're talking public. So that's the same thing there on those two.

The next page, on page 20 – that goes back to what we were talking about – the no side lot setbacks – we've got to get that figured out.

On page 21 ...

Councilmember Hickman – Hold on. So on 20, what are you talking about – there are no side lot setbacks?

Ms. Hudson – On 20, number 8, on Siting. So it's in conflict with ...

Mr. Morris – The way it's being interpreted.

Ms. Hudson – The way it is interpreted. Right. So we want to either – and there could be a discussion as far as – there's no side lot setbacks required if you can meet the Fire and Building Code. You know, if you've got an adjacent property that the house is far enough away on an adjacent lot, if you're doing fire construction on those walls that you're building, then you should be able to go up to the property line.

Councilmember Hickman – So is this what we've been talking about – I think we have it on the agenda to talk about it in the Townhouse – number 5 on the agenda. Is that what this deals with?

Ms. Hudson – Yes.

Councilmember Hickman – Well, I think I've heard from the committee – I'm going to take a step into this water. If it gets too deep, we're going to table this. In the Townhouse/Small Apartment area – blue – are we comfortable saying that we're not going to require a side yard setback – meaning that if they can build to the side lot line, we will let them, but they still have a building code requirement of 3'1" to be away from another structure that maybe doesn't have the firewall. But if they can get to the lot line without being within that prohibited area by our building code, which is a fire safety issue, which I don't think we can get around, then are we okay allowing that? I think it's important that's limited to the Townhouse/Small Apartment area – the blue area. Because we don't want to do that in the Detached area – the yellow. I think since the pink area is the duplex area, maybe we keep that 5' buffer there, since we're not talking about the row house look you'd have of a townhouse, anyway. But in the blue area, if we wanted to create these projects that we've been talking about, if we wanted it to be interpreted where you don't have to have that, other than when the building code requires it. It seems to me that's the way it reads. It's not been interpreted that way, to some extent, it sounds like. I don't know if this is a change in the wording or not, other than maybe the change in the wording here is to make it clear that this is for the blue area. But do we have a consensus on that? Does anybody oppose that idea? Of allowing them to go to the lot line, as long as it meets the other building code requirements?

Mr. McKown – That would be the case for blue and orange. Urban General, we're already – I think we're required to build.

Councilmember Hickman – I agree. We can include orange, too. I think that orange is maybe already being allowed. I don't know. It would include everything but yellow and pink. It would also include red, probably.

Mr. McKown – Yeah.

Councilmember Hickman – Downtown. Jane, does that give you the clarification you need? So I can scratch it off the list of agenda topics?

Ms. Hudson – One down.

Councilmember Hickman – So you were going on – on page 20, did you talk about garage and parking? We skipping that?

Ms. Hudson – We're skipping that right now.

I'm on page 21. Number 3, this is also listed in the form districts under the blue and the yellow – about the windows. The sill is at least 6' above its finished floor. That just doesn't meet the building code. I know they're trying to get away from side windows, per se.

Mr. Morris – So just strike that, so it would force somebody to meet it by doing a. Now you're not violating the building code.

Councilmember Hickman – So what are you suggesting?

Mr. Morris – Striking b.

Councilmember Hickman – Striking b. Everybody okay with that? Alright. Jane?

Ms. Hudson – Okay. Then on page 22, that goes back to this at least one functioning entry door, which we're going to continue on at the next meeting. Correct?

Councilmember Hickman – What is this thing you have written about what is this? Who determines?

Ms. Hudson – Oh, it just says "except high impact quality". What is that? Is that DRT?

Mr. Petromilli – Are you talking about the stucco? Usually with the high impact they have a metal mesh instead of fabric mesh or no mesh at all. It stands up to hail better.

Mr. McCabe – Isn't that more of a – is that kind of what you're talking about, Peter, more of your backing material. You're using more of a fiberboard – cement board, as opposed to a Styrofoam board as a backer?

Mr. Petromilli – Well, if you use Styrofoam you'll use like a metal mesh instead of a fabric or no mesh at all. So it stands up. Like the Bricktown Ballpark they used EIFS and they used the high impact one so it stands up to the baseballs. You can see some dents.

Ms. Hudson – So do we want to say with a metal mesh – it has to have a metal mesh.

Mr. Petromilli – Either that, or just the high impact. The manufacturers have a standard for high impact.

Ms. Hudson – That's good.

Councilmember Hickman – You want to scratch that? Okay. Page 23. This is the sign discussion. Tabled.

Ms. Hudson – Under the Lighting Standards on page 24. Street lights – that last line there it says: "Full cut-off fixtures are required." It concerns me that we have existing pedestrian lights within this area, and if we have someone come in and put a full cut-off fixture – I mean, a full cut-off fixture is not a pedestrian light, typically. I mean, you see pedestrian lights, they're the globe type lights that we have down on Santa Fe, in front of – adjacent to Bill's project. Do we want a full cut-off fixture there? We want to continue the same pedestrian lights that are within the area?

Councilmember Hickman – I think we want to transition to full cut-off fixtures. That's the new norm. It reduces the light pollution and we, as a City, are beginning to implement those in areas in town right now. I know Public Works is starting to put in full cut-off.

Ms. Hudson – Okay.

Mr. Adair – So this precludes the traditional coach light that you would see on the front of a house?

Ms. Hudson – No. These are just street lights. We're talking about strictly pedestrian street lights.

Mr. Adair – I'm confusing the lighting ordinance that's coming in.

Mr. Petromilli – Richard, how would that affect walkability?

Mr. McKown – This is the thing. We've got to have a safe, well-lit environment. Anybody disagree with that? So then, how do we achieve it without having a whole lot of light glare?

Councilmember Hickman – I guess the implication is that full cut-off fixtures don't provide adequate lighting, and I think most people say that they do. I mean, they do – it's just directed down and out, versus up – versus 360.

Mr. McKown – So who is putting in these street lights anyway? Are individual projects putting in these street lights? Or are these the City's street lights that we're talking about?

Mr. Morris – Individuals are putting them in. That's how we've been directed.

Mr. McKown – Now, a street light on a pole out in the right-of-way?

Mr. McCabe – Yes.

Mr. McKown – Who is it connected to? Whose meter? Whose electric meter? Because street lights all over town are part of the City's infrastructure. But are you connecting yours to the City's meters?

Mr. McCabe – Haven't done ours yet.

Mr. Morris – Yeah, we're still at the very beginning of this process with a lot of unanswered questions like this.

Mr. McKown – The standard has been OG&E has gone to these old-timey looking ones that are fake old – I'm not particularly fond of them, although they're in all my neighborhoods, and it's just a big plastic acorn and it shoots light straight out the top. It

would be so easy to put an opaque lid on it, instead of a plastic top, to direct the light down. But that's not an option for them. So you're having to go buy a light fixture.

Councilmember Hickman – Full cut-off lighting is what's required – that's what our commercial code change was to – for full cut-off lighting. So if you have a commercial development in Norman, you're putting in full cut-off lighting.

Mr. McKown – So we're going to have street lights out in the right-of-way of every different make and model imaginable with each individual project. Is that what we intend?

Councilmember Hickman – This is an area of transition – Center City.

Mr. Brewer – Well, I think the question is do we want to put in a standard that has full cut-off lighting, that is a standard design? Because this is really just asking if we want to go with the standard design that we have in other pedestrian areas. So do we want to have a different standard for the area? What you're saying is each individual developer is putting in a different kind of lighting, then you're going to have all this mish-mash of different designs of lighting. So if we want to do full cut-off lighting, that's fine. We just need to get a standard design that has full cut-off lighting.

Councilmember Hickman – I don't have a problem about the type of fixture. I do, personally, think that we should continue to require full cut-off fixtures, though.

Mr. McCabe – Wasn't a lot of the discussion on the full cut-off, if I remember correctly, were some of the larger houses being built that backed up against an existing neighborhood and putting the large lights in the back yard? Wasn't that where the discussion – all of this really was from? Not necessarily in the front street – the walkability. It was the large places being built that were putting on the lights, because the back yards became a parking lot, and then they were lighting up the back yards, which was lighting up the neighbors' back yards, and that's when we first started talking about the full cut-off in the residential area. I don't ever really remember us discussing this along the street frontage where pedestrians are walking.

Councilmember Hickman – Yeah. What you're talking about, Keith, is a potential ordinance that the City is considering – not to require full cut-off fixtures, but to give somebody the right as a neighbor to complain about another neighbor shining lights into their yard. This part about full cut-off fixtures was what the consultant recommended. Why they didn't recommend a specific fixture, I don't know, unless it's in here in another section. But what they have done is they have addressed the issue that the City is considering addressing in part b here about direct lights shall be shielded from view from public spaces and adjoining properties. The whole point of part of that, also, is the idea of full cut-off lighting – is that the full cut-off lighting is going to push the light down versus in the 360. You still have the same amount of lighting and illumination, you just have it where you want it, in a more directed nature.

Mr. McCabe – It just seems like to me that this is, again, another area where the people who designed this were designing a complete street to be demoed and rebuilt, and then that's where you would do this. With these individual lots that we're building, it doesn't make sense to me.

Mr. McKown – Where is the conflict? The full cut-off at 9 to 12' above, etc.

Mr. Brewer – The conflict is that here are existing pedestrian lights that have that old design.

Mr. McKown – If we have a City fixture that isn't in conformance with this, are now requiring it to go back to that developer who happens to be abutting that lot and make them come up with a ...

Mr. Brewer – I think that would be a very appropriate use of TIF funds, to go in and convert those. I, personally – to get a congruent look and to have – to choose a design that's set for this area, that potentially matches whatever we have along West Main Street. I don't know what we have right now. I can't remember. And start that conversion over time. That seems appropriate, in a full cut-off setting – or full cut-off design. That also makes sense to me, because I live with a street lamp in front of my house that there's a reason we have black-out curtains in our daughter's room, because otherwise she'd be up all night because there's light coming straight in. But if you have full cut-off, it serves the pedestrian along the sidewalk and serves just as you were saying. So I think it's just a matter of full cut-off is fine, but we need to find a standard design that we then start converting the existing pedestrian lights over time.

Councilmember Hickman – How about we just do this? Full cut-off fixtures are required and a fixture approved by the City. Maybe we just say that whatever fixture is used has to be approved by the City. Eventually we can to where we talk about the TIF, because I agree with you. As streets are redone, that's, to me, when that should be addressed.

Mr. McKown – Are we going to have a light fixture every 50'? Every 60'?

Ms. Hudson – 100' on other frontage streets. On Storefront, 75 for Urban General, and 100' on other frontage streets.

Mr. McKown – So if it's intended to want to have them every 100', but we're making each individual 50' project put one out ...

Mr. McCabe – That's only if, Richard, we're further away than that 100' of the existing light that's from the City provides right now. So it would depend upon which lot you bought. If you bought the good lot with the light you were good. If you bought the next one over ...

Mr. Brewer – I don't want to jump ahead too much, but I think when we talk about the TIF, that's part of what I would propose is coming up with, in a master plan for

infrastructure development, where those lights would go. So that's not even a question of every 100'; it's just this is where it goes and that's designed.

Councilmember Hickman – Okay. So put this on the list to talk about when we get to the TIF, Jane. Let's see if we can get through this before the meeting ends.

Ms. Hudson – I want to ask a question real quick. So some of the stuff that's in the upcoming sections, we've gone over it and we've said that we're going to postpone it to the next meeting and stuff like that. But there is one thing that I wanted to discuss, and since we have the staff here from Stormwater, is it okay if we go ahead and jump to number 3 and so we can discuss the 65% requirement with Stormwater here? They don't have a presentation, per se, but I need them here for questions, as far as detention requirements and so on and so forth. Is that okay?

Councilmember Hickman – Let's do that. I agree. I was just looking at my phone and the time. So let's move on to item number 3 about the discussion and potential action regarding the impervious surface area within the Center City Form Based Code.

Ms. Hudson – Carrie Evenson is here. I know there will be questions that everybody has, as far as last time we talked about the impervious coverage maintained at 65% for the yellow, blue, and pink zones – this is to be discussed at the next meeting. Stormwater Division outline possibly presenting some basic information to the committee. So as far as this area that we're talking about in the Form Based Code, within the residential areas – the yellow, blue and pink zones – restricting the coverage to 65%, would be 40% for the structures, 25% for the remaining area. Is that something that the committee wants to require? And if we want to allow them an additional area over that 65%, what requirements would you want them to have to meet as far as detaining or installing proper detention area on the lot to get to 75%? Whatever you guys decide that you want to have, remembering that we're having some problems with citizens concerned with flooding of their yards. Do we want to have areas in the parking lot in the back of these developments that have detention areas?

Mr. Adair – My concern last time was we did a parking requirement based on the number of bedrooms, which I supported and was in agreement with. That reduces density. Now we're talking about a coverage requirement, which again will further reduce density. I can't merge those two and say to what extent we're restricting density. The blue area is designed to increase density between downtown and Campus Corner. That's what it's there for. And we're stacking restrictions on top of that that weren't part of the original code. I'm not questioning that there's drainage issues. We did a TIF because we've got aging – or in some cases, non-existent – infrastructure. We've got alleys that are gravel. I want to hear the City's storm sewer TIF solutions for the area. Nobody is questioning we've got some drainage issues. I don't think any of us really want to impact them. But they were there when we did this to begin with and they're still there today. I'm looking for the answers to solve the problems, not to water this down to less than it was intended to be.

Councilmember Hickman – Jim, I'm going to respectfully disagree. 65% impervious surface area has been the limit in residential zones in the City of Norman – period. It was, in my opinion, an error by staff – and I'll say it – an error – I think it was a mistake – it was wrong. I was told to my face that 65% was the impervious area and, as an elected official, I told my constituents that was going to be the same rule, because I relied upon what I was told by a former staff member that 65% was still the rule. Because that was the rule everywhere residentially. Now, somewhere during that conversations and this being implemented and projects coming forward and alternative interpretations being advocated by developers – I don't know. Then come to find out, no, it was being interpreted to be that it was more than 65%. This open space porches – whatever – these other private spaces were being deemed to be allowed to be considered a part of the impervious surface area. That's where I take exception to this whole discussion. Is that we're trying now to peel back to what was the rule – period – in my opinion, to now say, well, we're taking things away from them. No, we're not. Anywhere else in this town, if you're building residential, it's 65% and it's that way for a reason. It's not because there's TIF money to fix it, because the TIF money is intended to fix lots of stuff. The stormwater is a small piece of it, and most of the flooding issues and the stormwater issues can't be dealt with with the TIF; they've got to be dealt with with the impervious surface limit and people either retaining or detaining on-site, which is also a problem. What we have done, in my opinion, does not affect density. In fact, we're going to encourage more density by adding more units on blue than what was being built there before. Before there were duplexes being built there. Now we're saying 3 units. In all the density books that I've read, density is about units. We're requiring more units now than we were getting. I'm not talking about bedrooms, because that's a whole different way of looking at it. But we're requiring more units. If I was to say to you, do you want projects that have 2 units or 4 units? Most of you would say well I want more density; I want the 4 units. We are an anomaly because you think about it in the context of bedrooms. Yeah, if you're talking about density in the context of more bodies packed into more individual units, like the duplexes we're getting, then maybe we're getting less density. But I would say that's not the density that you want, or the people in this town that I hear talking about live/work/play, keeping the millennials, having alternative housing types. So there's different kinds of density, as well.

But, on this impervious surface area issue, as I said before, even before the Form Based Code went into place, we got the old style duplexes built – period -- and with the higher parking requirements. So I want to understand how people think it's okay in the Center City area to allow 85% impervious surface area without getting something in return, like best practices from our Stormwater Division, on-site underground storage, other things that address the impervious surface area. Because I've heard people in this town on the west side and other where say, oh, that's Central Norman's problem on their flooding issue – I don't want to pay for a bond – I don't want to pay to fix tens of millions of dollars of infrastructure needs for stormwater in the Imhoff Creek watershed, which is where we're talking about.

So, with all due respect, if that's going to be the attitude of the town, then we have to realize that we can't make it any worse. I can sit here and argue and advocate that the impervious surface area should be 55% in this area, because it's already so over-capacity. We've got a part of this town right now that, on a heavy rain day, you can't

go east and west across Main Street, Gray Street, Symmes Street, Acres Street, Daws Street – right here in the back of City Hall we had flooding not too long ago where the helicopters were flying over showing a truck in the ditch. It's a WPA 1930 channel. That channel can't support – and the money is not here to rebuild the whole thing to increase this density. So those are inconsistent deals. If we want density and want redevelopment, there is not the money to redo the entire stormwater infrastructure. So we're either setting ourselves up for failure, if we don't take into account the stormwater issue and how we allow these developments to go forward, in my opinion.

Mr. Brewer – This is where I left it in my mind at the last meeting, was that I had no issue with 65% impervious surface requirement. But if there's the ability to offset that with best practices in stormwater management, that let's say the offsets equivalent is additional 10% in impervious surface, then we can credit that 10% back to the developer. So you have 75% impervious surface, but they are required to implement the best – I don't know what those are. But the best practices in stormwater management. So that's what I want to hear about. I mean, I want to hear what those requirements are, what the reality is, both from a feasibility perspective, what that offset really looks like, what the cost is on the development side. And so, it was not a matter of the 65% -- I agree. It is an issue – it is a major issue. This is not something that we should just waive just because we're doing density for density's sake. If we have the ability to offset that, and the developer is required to pay for that portion, that seems like a reasonable offset. I mean, it essentially should be a wash and the same thing. That's what I'm interested in hearing. And if that's today, or at another meeting, I don't know.

Mr. McCabe – I'm going to jump with Cameron here. I agree. The problems we have – you didn't mention my street of Eddington, or the Lake Eddington. But I think if we look at a 65% that the whole City is held to, but then when Jim says we want to build – we want to encourage – and I get that. I think if a builder or a developer is able to take it to 80 and is responsible for the retention – whatever you want to call it for the additional above the 65, I think that's a good compromise. I think it allows the builder/developer to still continue building the properties that he can build. He's just going to be responsible for the stormwater runoff over the 65, that we're only asking of anybody else. So maybe that's a compromise we look at.

Councilmember Hickman – Carrie, what would that look like?

Ms. Evenson – One of the things that we talked about – and I think our conversation kind of went along this line, as well – is that the 65 was where you start, and then if you wanted to move up into that higher percent of impervious you're looking at providing other types of controls on-site. Whether that's disconnecting your downspouts, cisterns, on-site storage of some kind, rain gardens, bioswales – there's lots of different options for green infrastructure that's out there to try to make sure to reduce that impact off-site. When we do new developments, what we're looking at is pre-development hydrology and post-development hydrology matching. Right? So that's where all the detention comes in. They've got a lot of raw land they can do that with potentially in developments. You don't have the same type of space on these infill developments, but you're having some

of the same types of impacts to your neighbors if you're not controlling that flow of water. So we want to look at is not just where is the water going when you're building – right? – because right now that's kind of what we're looking at, is we're looking at is the water making it to the street or to the alleyway, rather than off onto your neighbor's back yard. We also want to look at how much and for how long is that water going. I think that's where we start to incentivize the use of green infrastructure by incorporating that into, if you want to go to 75%, 80% impervious, you've got to deal with that runoff with some sort of green infrastructure.

Mr. Brewer – So, Carrie, is it possible to create almost a menu of – if you put in a bioswale, that's an additional 4%. I don't know all the examples you just gave, but something like that where there's still a maximum – you can't fill out that entire menu and get to 100% impervious surface. But that just seems like a potential solution to – because I know that not all solutions are created equal. So if a bioswale is better than what you said about downspouts – that you're credited for certain practices more than others. I also think that this is a really great opportunity to do some things that we have not done in a lot of developments in our city – to start saying this is where – these are best practices and these are things that can solve our solutions long-term and we have an opportunity to do it in this area. So is that something – can you feasibly put a number or percentage, or something like that, to these different solutions?

Ms. Evenson – I think that's possible to do. It's going to take more research than just the little bit of time I've had here. I'll have to do some research on what some other cities are doing. But there are other cities that are doing things like this, so we just have to figure out how this would work for Norman. Soils play a very important role in these green infrastructure techniques, because in our tight clay soils, we're not going to get the infiltration, so proper design of these systems – to size them appropriately, to have a 24-48 hour storage capacity so that when it's discharging it's discharging after the peak flow has come through to keep that peak a little bit lower. It's all going to come down to, in this area, proper design and proper design has to take into account the soils in Center City.

Ms. McMahon – Carrie, forgive this because I don't know a lot about this, but would that vary – the soil, I wouldn't imagine, would vary that dramatically from lot to lot, but could this be – so Cameron's point on the percentages – would that be something that could vary per lot, per development?

Ms. Evenson – I really don't think so. It's going to be a bigger – since this area is pretty contained, you may have very similar soils on most of this.

Ms. McMahon – I didn't know if there were other factors.

Mr. McKown – There are two factors in Oklahoma that make this really difficult, compared to the places in the United States that have pioneered this – around Chesapeake Bay and Prince Georges County, Maryland – they've been trying to figure this out for the better part of 30 years. Seattle. So one is the rainfall – it occurs very frequently and very

rarely do they get 4" in an hour, like we get. So we've got coupled the flash flooding with impervious soil, and when you go look at cities that have had great success – like part of Arkansas, Kansas City – they're in the world of porous limestone, so once you get through a layer of topsoil you've basically got a subsurface system that just is pulling the water out. The research we've been doing all these years with Dr. Kaufman at Trailwoods – they're not infiltration gardens; they're filtration gardens, and it's technologically very, very different and unique in the nation. Most of what you'll find, like in parts of Texas, where you've got the flash flooding and this high plains system that we live in, where there's a lot of clay and subject to flash flooding, these things simply don't get done. So the best practices are hard. You put a giant rain barrel – it's full – it rained a lot yesterday. Well, what about today's rain? So we've got to come up with means and methods – it's kind of an everything approach.

I've been working on the streetscape – back to the TIF – looking at some stuff that's been going on in St. Louis, where they've taken all of the corner intersections and the bulb-outs. We've kind of got to take an all-in, full everything approach to make this work and create a healthy landscape that – a tree does a huge amount of work for you as well, but it's got to get big. The bigger the tree, the more water it can soak up. That all said, I've given this a lot of thought since last meeting. If we were to simply say if your project is the equivalent of more than 65% coverage, then you've got to engineer a solution. Peter tried really hard to do a porous paving solution. We've got to make those kinds of things possible and legal in order to be able – we can't say you've got to do a solution, and then turn around and go, well, that's against the rules. So there's probably an underlying conflict. But if we made that the rule, it would effectively limit projects to a 65% coverage equivalent. The problem is we go back and we say, oh, no, 65% coverage. That's going to get interpreted as you won't end up with buildings that reach their full potential, and you're going to end up with little bits of useless green space that are just there for no other reason than to meet the coverage ratio requirement. So I think getting at the spirit of where you're wanting to go, where we're not increasing the rate beyond what is allowed elsewhere, can be done by what Cameron is describing – if you're going over the 65% you've got to engineer a solution through best practices. It effectively accomplishes the coverage ratio that you're looking to ...

Councilmember Hickman – Just to be clear, I don't have a fundamental problem – and my CPTC committee has been working on low-impact development and other things, and so as a community we're working on this. I just want to be clear that, if we're going to go over 65%, I think that the engineered solution needs to still maintain the rate of flow and the drainage to the abutting properties to be the same as if it was 65% and to the same level as it was before, and we're not making things worse. With those kind of caveats, if they go to 85% but they engineer a solution that doesn't affect the neighbor, doesn't create more runoff, then I think that's explainable. But what we have right now is 85%, Katy bar the door, anything goes. And we're making things worse. And that's hard for me to accept.

Mr. McKown – I think this reinforces the idea of lower bedroom count. So you come in and you say I'm going to do a small apartment and it's going to have four 3-bedroom apartments in it, as opposed to a duplex with 6 bedrooms on each side, which would

require 12 parking spaces, which would effectively – it's impossible. You can't pave – there's just physically not enough room. But you would have to pave the whole lot to 90% to even accomplish that. So if you came in and you said, well, I'm going to have four 3-bedroom apartments – same number of bedrooms, but it's now smaller bite-size apartments and you're only required to do 6 parking spaces, as opposed to 12 – you're leaving room for 1) to do those parking spaces through some best practices, and 2) you're not paving over the whole lot. So this is probably going in a good direction to steer away from the 6-bedroom duplex that ...

Ms. Hall – Yeah. I've thought a lot about this, too, since our last meeting. It just seems really important to get back to that 65% that's consistent with the rest of Norman in the worst part of Norman for drainage and flooding and all of those other things. That just makes a whole lot of sense. I really think that was the intent to begin with. So it got interpreted, or how it got in the final form, I think it's important that we get back to that. I think that anything that we can do to your points about being the model area of town for best practices and managing stormwater and showing the rest of Norman how it can be done in the place where it's the biggest challenge, probably – I think the harder it is to do, the more incentive that you get to do it.

Mr. Adair – Be it right or I think the prevailing opinion at this point is it was wrong – it was not done by accident the first time. Coverage – open space requirements were set at 15%. It very specifically included patios and some areas to absolutely increase coverage. I mean, it did not happen by accident, Bill. I'm not saying – like I said, that doesn't mean we can't change it. But it was part of the design that was brought to us by Mary.

Mr. McKown – I remember it the same way Jim is describing it, as well.

Mr. Adair – Carrie, I believe during the last stormwater proposal there was a large detention pond proposed on Andrews Park. Is that correct?

Ms. Evenson – There was detention proposed.

Mr. Adair – Which got criticism, because they probably hadn't seen the design concepts of it. I've built my share of detention ponds, and I can build them a little larger and a little wider so that you've got a soccer field on the bottom of them 99% of the time. The library, before it was purchased for a library, was considered for a regional detention facility. Are you all looking for regional detention solutions in this area? Part of the reason I'm asking is because we also keep hearing criticism of we're not seeing the City make efforts for green space in the area. I think there's an opportunity to combine those.

Ms. Evenson – There definitely is an opportunity. Have we identified particular locations? Not yet. We may identify them, but how do we then fund acquisition? Andrews Park was proposed because that's land the City owns. So putting a solution there, and it's toward the headwaters of Imhoff Creek so it makes sense. But it is something that we have to start thinking about. Long-term, how do we make these improvements?

Mr. Adair – Solutions probably aren't going to come to you. You have to go find them.

Councilmember Hickman – Just to summarize – Jayne?

Ms. Crumpley – I had – whatever lot coverage is decided, it should not come back on the people who are impacted by it if it doesn't work. We are flooded every time it rains by what was built next to us. Carrie and Scott came out trying to seek solutions. So our only recourse is civil suit. We can't afford that. So whatever they do, whether it's 65%, 75% -- if it doesn't flow right, it needs to come back somewhere to either the person who built it, the design, the TIF, or whatever – who are responsible for correcting that. That's my big concern. Because we have a mess.

Councilmember Hickman – I agree.

Mr. Petromilli – I'm sorry. I have a follow-up question, and it's for Richard. When you're working in an urban area like downtown Oklahoma City or something doing a large development, how do you address – I've never done that before, and so I think – so your practices there might help us understand more about how we address stormwater in that urban environment.

Mr. McKown – That's a great question, and I'm glad that we ended up having some conversation after our last meeting about this, so that I can answer that. The City of Oklahoma City has a great gift of having upsized all of their storm sewer systems way back when they channelized what is today the Oklahoma River, and basically their pipes are enormous. You could ride a cow down some of those storm sewer pipes that feed into the Oklahoma River. So there's no detention required. You can cover every square inch – in fact, you're kind of encouraged to cover every square inch to get the kind of density that is – and there is no parking requirement to downtown Oklahoma City for any use. It's entirely market-driven – the parking requirement. We don't have that gift here, is the thing. What Cameron is talking about is – these are TIF sort of things that we might need to build that physical infrastructure first and then come back and review whether or not we can load it up more.

Councilmember Hickman – Huge difference is, 1) we don't have an Oklahoma River to dump this water into. It goes into Imhoff Creek and downstream Imhoff Creek is where the people's houses are about to start falling into the creek that didn't get funded by the bond that failed. There's \$20 million of work to be done in that stretch alone, and I've seen – if anybody wants to go with me into the creek, you can see where those pipes are discharging water that used to come from Lindsey Street and other places into that creek and you can see how the creek is getting destroyed – I mean, literally. So fundamentally, we don't have a river that can just take all of this water. We're putting it into creeks and then it goes from the creek down to the Canadian River. We don't have a pipe system – at least not in this area, to my knowledge – that runs all the way to the Canadian River to dump this storm water. So there are just some fundamental challenges that, even if we updated every single storm pipe in this area with TIF funds, it still all has to go somewhere and where it would go is to the Imhoff Creek, and that creek is already over-

saturated and eroding out. So we have, unfortunately, a built-in challenge that we can't do anything about the condition of that creek without tens of millions of dollars.

Mr. McKown – Peter had one other follow-up.

Mr. Petromilli – No, that's okay. I was just saying, yeah, we're kind of stuck in this hard situation because, as you had mentioned, we don't have the luxury of the Oklahoma River. But most urban environments where we're trying to achieve a higher density, which is what we're trying to achieve here, do something different than any other area in Norman has – we're doing something different in the blue and Form Based Code in the Center City area than any other area in Norman. I think that's why the 65% was omitted, is because we are doing something different here. It's not just any other residential area in Norman. Typically, in an urban environment like you're used to and I'm used to developing in, we have the infrastructure already in place to account for that. Here in Norman we don't. It's been said the problem was here well before. I know that none of my developments have any more than 65% right now and I've still put in detention and storm drainage -- a 12" line that ties into an 8" line and every time it rains my 12" line drains my site just perfectly and there's a geyser at the end where it ties into the 8" line that's full of mud.

Councilmember Hickman – I agree. Those infrastructure things through the TIF do need to be addressed. So on the stormwater topic, in general, to give Carrie and others some guidance, it sounds like there's kind of three – and this is kind of another issue, is that requiring some kind of a drainage plan that shows the current runoff and the projected future runoff based on the development, which I think is a standard thing that's required in other places where they haven't been platted, at least. Then from that plan, require that they keep their runoff from the lot the same pre-redevelopment and not having any of the runoff from current project go onto abutting properties. Then part 3 would be that they bring forward an engineered green infrastructure, best management practice-type solution which could be underground storage, could be bioswales, cisterns, rain barrels, etc. We start with the plan to see what it is now, what it's going to be under this new deal, that the way they design the stormwater runoff doesn't cause more runoff, be above 65%, or currently allowed, which is kind of how our rules are currently. If you've got a lot right now that's over 65%, we don't make you take it down to 65%; we'll let you stay where you're at, just to be clear. And that you don't push more water off onto the neighboring property owner. And then you implement some best management practice. Is that, Carrie, kind of ...

Ms. Evenson – I think the other thing, too, that I want to bring into this conversation is long-term maintenance for green infrastructure in place, in order to make sure that it continues to be effective by 10, 20 years from now. There's got to be some kind of maintenance plan and agreement so that there is some way to ensure that maintenance gets done over time.

Councilmember Hickman – The point that's important, to me at least, I think to the community is that these engineered solutions – the quality of the storm water is important.

To me, it's less important in this environment. What's more important is the volume – that we manage the volume of the water, and not necessarily the cleaning of the stormwater. While that's important, to me the more important piece is the volume.

Mr. McKown – But Carrie's point about maintenance – you have sediment that goes in and fills it up and then reduces the capacity. Even when it's all finished, the rain is constantly washing the mountains away. This is just how nature works. Right?

Councilmember Hickman – You would agree that there needs to be some system for maintenance long-term?

Mr. McKown – Yeah.

Councilmember Hickman – Yeah. I agree. Just like you guys have to do in your projects.

Mr. McKown – For both quality and quantity.

Councilmember Hickman – Yeah. I was just saying from the engineered solutions – like you were saying, sometimes bioswales are good at filtering out pollutants, making the stormwater cleaner, but they don't really help retain storm water on-site or reduce the stormwater as much.

Mr. McKown – Depends on how they're built.

Councilmember Hickman – Good point. So does that give you some guidance, Carrie? Maybe you could bring back just a one-pager of what we might incorporate into the Form Based Code area as a part of 65% will be the standard in these residential zones, but you can go up to 85% if you do a, b and c. Is that kind of what you guys were looking for – thinking about?

Mr. McKown – That makes sense.

Mr. Adair – I don't know how practical this is. As much as we can, I'd like to see – and Scott, you may be able to help us here – some cookie-cutter solutions for part of this. To do the caliber of engineering we're talking about on a 50' lot can get cost-prohibitive really quick.

Mr. McKown – I was just reading an article this week on a massive rain barrel and I'm like, I want to build one of those. I could totally see one that had the bottom 50% is your water storage that you irrigate with, and the top has a hole in it that just basically lets the water bleed off at a very slow rate, so that – I think there are ways it could be done in an urban condition that basically reset for Oklahoma storm season.

Mr. Adair – Let me say I think the coverage of my home is about 64.8%, because of my swimming pool is an impervious surface.

Mr. McKown – Well, it is. Yeah.

Mr. Adair – My swimming pool has got that much freeboard in it. It's a retention facility until I choose to let it out when it's not raining. It is a practical solution and it catches a lot of water. But we view it as an impervious surface, and give nothing for it. Actually penalize for it.

Councilmember Hickman – Well, I see that you guys are having such a wonderful fun time, you don't mind going past the 4:00 time. We are at the end of our time. I appreciate the discussion. We have made some progress, but, as you can see, we still have a lot of things to cover. So we will regroup with the things that we have gone through. We will finish trying to go through the manual next time. And hope that Carrie can find time to come back and present to us what she prepares and then hopefully we can take action on that. Then that will lead us into the discussion about the orange area – the Urban Storefront and then the TIF, and hopefully we can get through all of those things next time.

Mr. McKown – If I could just report. I've been doing a little homework since we last enjoyed each other's company. This is the whole area and I've been going through looking at some various parking details and with two fundamentally – like a wider east/west section and a narrower north/south. So in the background I'm trying to get my arms around what is the potential for on-street parking and, of course, every one of those little green patches is a future storm water bioswale a la St. Louis. Anyway, just wanted you to know I was doing that.

Councilmember Hickman – Alright. Thanks, Richard.

Ms. Hudson – Just as a reminder, if you guys have input for that complete and discrete, please send it in. We've got the next meeting on May 15 from 2:00 to 4:00 again. It would be nice if you guys sent comments in, suggestions – we can go through those. We can organize them and we can send them out to the group long before the meeting.

Councilmember Hickman – I'm going to give you guys, potentially, some homework. Please do look through this that you already have. Look at Jane's notes or comments. Call – email Jane or staff if you have questions about what she's recommending. This has been sent out already to all of you all via an email. You can look at her comments and questions, because my hope is – and I'm not trying to be difficult, but this is kind of the number 1 priority. It's why we did the administrative delay, to help staff to be able to answer these questions. So I do want to plow through the rest of this. So to the extent that you can go through this in advance, so when we come in here next time we can try to move through the remaining topics quickly, and then circle back around to the things that we tabled – like the signage and the façade deal. Because we've really got to get those things done, because that was really the impetus of why we did the delay.

I know we have a lot of other great topics that we want to talk about. I'll just tell you that I've already kind of mentioned to some people, including staff, and I haven't said it to the Mayor yet – I want to recognize Mayor Miller. She snuck in behind us. But

it's possible – I can very well see that some of these topics are going to be things that might have to be continued by some group – whether it's this group or some other group – post-administrative delay, as kind of a working ad hoc group of – reviewing things related to this that might make recommendations to Council, to staff down the road because, just being realistic, I'm not sure we're going to get through all of these things in a meaningful way in the timeline that we have for staff to do the work that they need to do and, therefore, maybe topics that carry over in some fashion. I don't know how that will look. Like I said, obviously the Mayor and rest of Council needs to hear that recommendation. That might be a recommendation that this committee makes, is that some group stays organized to continue to discuss these remaining topics and to make recommendations. So, in my mind, I'm just kind of sharing with you what I can see maybe happening, just from a time perspective. But that's why we're trying to get the things that are most critical to the staff getting back to work on this and lifting the administrative delay – getting those issues addressed as quickly as possible. That's kind of why we've structured this sort of that way.

Mr. Brewer – I completely hear what you're saying and it does seem almost impossible to be able to get through all of this.

Councilmember Hickman – Just to be clear, the design review deal – that was an oversight.

Mr. Brewer – Sure. My only suggestion would be to – if we do go past the administrative delay, to continue this discussion as quickly as we can. Because I think that every one of these items, in a different way, is going to affect the long-term value.

Councilmember Hickman – I agree 100%, Cameron. So that's why I think this committee will probably need to make that recommendation when we get to the end of our meetings. Make the recommendation so that the elected officials – the Mayor and others can formally see that's a recommendation to continue this group. Because, in theory, when the administrative delay ends, we would maybe be disbanded. I'm just trying to be upfront and transparent. I don't know if it's feasible that we'll get through all this. Some of you may want to continue to serve. The Mayor and Council may want to reconstitute some of the committee. I don't know. I just wanted to be up-front and transparent with everybody, that I can see a need for the committee to continue in some fashion to address some topics that we may not, honestly, just be able to get to in full fairness.

Anybody have anything else? Jane? I wanted to tell you guys that staff has been working very, very hard on this. I want to recognize all of them so much for all of their hard work. They have been really doing the Lord's work and putting in extra time on supporting you guys. So I really want to thank them for that, and thank all you guys for your time.

Just while you're here, tomorrow at 3:00 the Community Planning and Transportation Committee will have its regular meeting for the month of April. It will be at 3:00 in this room. Our next meeting for the Ad Hoc Committee is the 15th from 2:00 to 4:00 and that will be in the room across the hall. What do they call that room? Multi-Purpose

Room. That will be our last 2:00 to 4:00 meeting and then, thankfully, I'll get to start having my lunch meetings from 11:00 to 1:00.

Okay. We are adjourned.

Adjourned at 4:10 p.m.